

Remarks

Claims 1-10, 12-15, 17-20, and 22-32 are pending in this application. Applicants have amended claims 1, 15, 17, 22, 23, and 27 and cancelled claims 11 and 21 to clarify the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 7, and 12-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 6,636,875 to Bashant et al. in view of U.S. patent 5,506,984 to Miller and U.S. patent publication 2005/0033481 to Budhraja et al. The Examiner rejected claims 2-6, 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bashant et al. in view of Miller and Budhraja et al. and further in view of Zhu. The Examiner rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bashant et al. in view of Miller and Budhraja et al. and further in view of DeVos et al. The Examiner rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bashant et al. in view of Miller and Budhraja et al. and further in view of U.S. patent 6,564,201 to Hamsa. The Examiner rejected claims 17-23 and 27-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bashant et al. in view of Miller and Zhu and Budhraja et al. The Examiner rejected claims 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bashant et al. in view of Miller, Budhraja et al., and Zhu and further in view of DeVos et al.

The combination of Bashant, Miller and Budhraja et al. does not suggest the invention recited in independent claims 1 or 15 since, among other things, the combination does not suggest providing the interfaces with context sensitive navigation functions that indicate which

of a plurality of systems is active, providing a virtual asset register that includes elements of the systems, a model for exchange of data between the systems, and cross-reference and mapping of relationships of the elements of the systems, and checking a consistency of attributes of the accessed or retrieved data utilizing the virtual asset register. Bashant only suggests adding data of known types of object, such as claims, billing, and web sales. Additionally, Bashant relates to synchronizing related data storage elements in disparate storage systems. The same data is entered in each system, as described at col. 10, lines 6-8. On the other hand, the claimed invention relates to disparate systems in which data may be separately entered in each system and then the method according to the claimed invention processes the information so that the data may be exchanged between disparate systems and duplicated in each system. The claimed invention is not a simple entry of the same data in a number of times in systems.

Additionally, Bashant et al. requires an application to send to a hub a header with new data so that it will be known where the data might be placed in a related system, as described at col. 6, line 45, through col. 7, line 10. As such, Bashant et al. requires modifications to or intervention in existing systems. On the other hand, as illustrated, for example, in Figs. 1 and 2, the claimed invention includes a system that does not require such modifications or intervention. This makes the claimed invention simpler, less costly and easier to implement since systems do not need to be modified to send out such headers. The claimed invention is meant to eliminate the need for generating elements such as headers required by Bashant et al. Additionally, Bashant et al. states that the header is necessary when data is changed as described at col. 10, line 65, though col. 11, line 6. The headers require the user of a system to know data that is automatically provided by the claimed invention. Without headers, the system suggested by

Bashant et al. does not function.

On the other hand, Miller only suggests a system for determining whether data is stored in particular databases. Miller suggests that rather than sending separate queries to multiple data bases, a query may be sent to a single "engine" or "broker" that will send the data requests to various databases to determine where data is stored and then retrieve the data when it is located, as described at col. 3, line 65, through col. 4, line 23.. Such a data retrieval system does not suggest replicating data related to the new object from the new object to other systems and relevant systems. Miller only suggests retrieval of data from databases and does not suggest integration of assets as in the claimed invention, which includes a virtual asset register.

Also, simply sending out data queries to databases does not suggest establishing a consistency of accessed or retrieved data in the relevant systems by mapping the new object using the virtual asset register. Furthermore, Miller does not suggest checking a consistency of attributes of the accessed or retrieved data utilizing a virtual asset register by identifying at least one of the new or a given object or copies of the new or a given object and comparing attributes of all copies of the same new or given object. Still further, the data retrieval method and system suggested by Miller does not suggest providing the interfaces with context sensitive navigation functions that indicate which of a plurality of systems is active, providing a virtual asset register that includes elements of the systems, a model for exchange of data between the systems, and cross-reference and mapping of relationships of the elements of the systems, and checking a consistency of attributes of the accessed or retrieved data utilizing the virtual asset register. The "engine" or "broker" does not suggest providing different systems with context sensitive

navigation functions that indicate which of a plurality of systems is active. Rather, the "engine" or "broker" is accessed to provide data searching and retrieval.

Budhraja et al. does not overcome the deficiencies of either Bashant or Miller. Along these lines, the Examiner only cited Budhraja et al. as suggesting interface elements. Budhraja et al. does not suggest any of the aspects of the claimed invention not suggested by Bashant et al. and Miller. Therefore, the combination of Bashant, Miller and Budhraja et al. does not suggest these aspects of the claimed invention.

In view of the above, the combination of Bashant, Miller and Budhraja et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claims 1, 7, and 12-15.

The combination of Bashant, Miller, Budhraja et al. and Zhu does not suggest the invention recited in claims 2-6, 9 and 10 since, among other things, the combination does not suggest providing the interfaces with context sensitive navigation functions that indicate which of a plurality of systems is active, providing a virtual asset register that includes elements of the systems, a model for exchange of data between the systems, and cross-reference and mapping of relationships of the elements of the systems, and checking a consistency of attributes of the accessed or retrieved data utilizing the virtual asset register, replicating data related to the new object from the new object to other systems and relevant systems, establishing a consistency of accessed or retrieved data in the relevant systems by mapping the new object using the virtual asset register or checking a consistency of attributes of the accessed or retrieved data utilizing a virtual asset register by identifying at least one of the new or a given object or copies of the new

or a given object and comparing attributes of all copies of the same new or given object. Zhu appears to suggest web-based communication among elements of a power system. Zhu suggests that "legacy" systems will simply operate as before. Zhu does not suggest any of the aspects of the invention not suggested by Bashant and Miller, such as a context sensitive interface.

Accordingly, the combination of Bashant, Miller, Budhraja et al. and Zhu does not suggest the invention recited in claims 2-6, 9 and 10.

The combination of Bashant, Miller, Budhraja et al. and DeVos et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claim 8 since, among other things, the combination does not suggest providing the interfaces with context sensitive navigation functions that indicate which of a plurality of systems is active, providing a virtual asset register that includes elements of the systems, a model for exchange of data between the systems, and cross-reference and mapping of relationships of the elements of the systems, and checking a consistency of attributes of the accessed or retrieved data utilizing the virtual asset register, replicating data related to the new object from the new object to other systems and relevant systems, establishing a consistency of accessed or retrieved data in the relevant systems by mapping the new object using the virtual asset register or checking a consistency of attributes of the accessed or retrieved data utilizing a virtual asset register by identifying at least one of the new or a given object or copies of the new or a given object and comparing attributes of all copies of the same new or given object. The Examiner only cites DeVos et al. as suggesting using a common information model with a resource description framework and a uniform resource identifier compatible with an identifier with a standard for the resource description framework. These elements do not suggest

the other aspects of the claimed invention not suggested by Bashant, Miller or Budhraja et al. Accordingly, the claimed invention is not obvious in view of the combination of Bashant, Miller, Budhraja et al. and DeVos et al. and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The combination of Bashant, Miller, Budhraja et al. and Hamsa does not suggest the invention recited in claim 11 since, among other things, the combination does not suggest providing the interfaces with context sensitive navigation functions that indicate which of a plurality of systems is active, providing a virtual asset register that includes elements of the systems, a model for exchange of data between the systems, and cross-reference and mapping of relationships of the elements of the systems, and checking a consistency of attributes of the accessed or retrieved data utilizing the virtual asset register, replicating data related to the new object from the new object to other systems and relevant systems, establishing a consistency of accessed or retrieved data in the relevant systems by mapping the new object using the virtual asset register or checking a consistency of attributes of the accessed or retrieved data utilizing a virtual asset register by identifying at least one of the new or a given object or copies of the new or a given object and comparing attributes of all copies of the same new or given object. The Examiner only cites Hamsa as suggesting object integration based on a template, which does not suggest the other aspects of the claimed invention not suggested by Bashant, Miller and Budhraja et al.. Accordingly, the claimed invention is not obvious in view of the combination of Bashant, Miller, Budhraja et al. and Hamsa and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The combination of Bashant et al., Miller, Zhu and Budhraja et al. does not suggest the

invention recited in claims 17-23 and 27-32 since, among other things, the combination does not suggest providing the interfaces with context sensitive navigation functions that indicate which of a plurality of systems is active, providing a virtual asset register that includes elements of the systems, a model for exchange of data between the systems, and cross-reference and mapping of relationships of the elements of the systems, and checking a consistency of attributes of the accessed or retrieved data utilizing the virtual asset register, replicating data related to the new object from the new object to other systems and relevant systems, establishing a consistency of accessed or retrieved data in the relevant systems by mapping the new object using the virtual asset register or checking a consistency of attributes of the accessed or retrieved data utilizing a virtual asset register by identifying at least one of the new or a given object or copies of the new or a given object and comparing attributes of all copies of the same new or given object. The shortcomings of Bashant et al., Miller, Zhu and Budhraja et al. are discussed above.

Accordingly, the combination of Bashant et al., Miller, Zhu and Budhraja et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claims 17-23 and 27-32. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The combination of Bashant, Miller, Budhraja et al., Zhu and DeVos et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claims 24-26 since, among other things, providing the interfaces with context sensitive navigation functions that indicate which of a plurality of systems is active, providing a virtual asset register that includes elements of the systems, a model for exchange of data between the systems, and cross-reference and mapping of relationships of the elements of the systems, and checking a consistency of attributes of the accessed or retrieved data utilizing the virtual asset register, replicating data related to the new object from the new object to other

systems and relevant systems, establishing a consistency of accessed or retrieved data in the relevant systems by mapping the new object using the virtual asset register or checking a consistency of attributes of the accessed or retrieved data utilizing a virtual asset register by identifying at least one of the new or a given object or copies of the new or a given object and comparing attributes of all copies of the same new or given object. The shortcomings of all of these references are discussed above. Since both these references fail to suggest major elements of the claimed invention, the combination of Bashant, Miller, Budhraja et al., Zhu and DeVos et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claims 24-26. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

In view of the above, the references relied upon in the office action do not suggest patentable features of the claimed invention. Therefore, the references relied upon in the office action do not make the claimed invention obvious. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections based upon the cited references.

In conclusion, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this case and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance.

If an interview would advance the prosecution of this case, Applicants urge the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The undersigned authorizes the Commissioner to charge fee insufficiency and credit

overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 22-0261.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 13, 2011

/Eric J. Franklin/
Eric J. Franklin, Reg. No. 37,134
Attorney for Applicants
Venable LLP
575 Seventh Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004
Telephone: 202-344-4936
Facsimile: 202-344-8300